

**Alexandria Township
Land Use Board
Meeting Minutes July 15, 2021**

Chair Phil Rochelle called the regular scheduled meeting of the Alexandria Township Land Use Board to Order at 7:30pm. The meeting was duly noticed.

Members Present: Chair Rochelle, Papazian, Fritsche, Freedman, Canavan, Committeeman Kiernan, Deputy Mayor Pfefferle, Giannone, Pauch and Kimsey.

Members Absent: Tucker and Hahola.

Board Professionals Present: Kara Kaczynski-Attorney, David Banisch-Planner, Tom Decker-Engineer

Others Present:

De Sapio Properties #6 Inc: Guy De Sapio-Attorney, Yuuji Crance-Witness, Antonio De Sapio- Member.
K Street: Larry Cohen-Attorney, Robert Aromando-Applicant, Peter Fleming-Engineer.

Minutes Approval

A motion to approve the June 17, 2021 Regular Meeting Minutes of the Land Use Board was made by **Papazian** and seconded by **Canavan**. **Ayes: Papazian, Fritsche, Freedman, Canavan, Committeeman Kiernan, Giannone, and Kimsey. Abstain: Chair Rochelle, Deputy Mayor Pfefferle, and Pauch. No Nays. Motion Carried.**

New and Pending Matters

- De Sapio Properties #6 Inc and Delaware River Tubing, LLC – Amended Site Plan – Public Hearing
Block 17.01 Lots 12
776 Milford-Frenchtown Road

The applicant has completed the witness testimony. Regarding the issue of de-marking the parking area so patrons would not park on the landfill, Attorney De Sapio advised the applicant could use barrels connected by a plastic chain. This picture was marked as exhibit A-5. In addition, he advised the applicant could install netting above the jersey barriers to disguise the life jackets and tubes. This was marked as exhibit A-6. Yuuji Crance advised the netting shown is 12'x20'. **Papazian** asked if it could be lowered to 6'. Crance said he could reduce the netting. **Decker** advised there was a discussion that the tubes should only be stacked to 6' high.

Banisch reminded the Board of variances required including, a variance for the changing buses and the increase in the number of buses on site. The applicant is requesting relief from the 2016 site plan approval to remove the jersey barriers during the off season. The applicant is seeking a variance for the outdoor storage of the rental equipment in the front yard. Outside storage is permitted in the IC district, but no storage is permitted in the front yard. A variance is needed from providing outside shielding and/or screening. The ordinance requires that outside storage be shielded from view from the public street. There is a request for prepared food and beverage sales indoors. There is no variance required as it is a permitted use. The applicant is requesting temporary structures for the shower, changing areas and tents in the front.

Banisch enumerated a number of design exceptions that are needed as well. He advised that per testimony given during the hearings shade trees cannot be planted on the strip of land between the

roadway and front of the building. **Banisch** advised this should be confirmed. If shade trees cannot be planted, he advised low growing shrubs should be planted in their stead. **Banisch** advised one day events for charity organizations could be completed through the adoption of the Special Events Ordinance which permits the issuance of a special events license. The applicant would not be constrained by what the Board may grant and does not need to conform to site plan approval in this case.

Banisch advised there is some concern over the outdoor storage of tubes, when there are many tubes stored inside. A picture of a street view from Google Earth from September 2019 was presented and marked as exhibit PB-4. **Kaczynski** advised the testimony so far has been that the tubes need to be stored outside due to mold related issues.

Banisch reviewed a potential list of conditions of the requested multiple variances for the Board's consideration circulated on July 15, 2021. One of those conditions was to have a lot closed sign once all 120 spaces are taken up. Another condition would be to install a post and rail fence on the southerly side of the lot, unless the applicant received a denial from the NJDEP for such a fence to be installed. The applicant shall be required to comply with all requirements and conditions of the 2016 prior site plan approval as outlines Decker's letter of 7/3/19, except as set forth or amended herein. The open unsatisfied items are the completion of the utility poles on the county road and the delineation of all parking spaces on site including the auto repair and all parking in the rear of the building. In total 36 conditions were enumerated. The last condition are improvements and uses associated with the amended approvals, including the outdoor storage, may not commence until adoption of the resolution of approval and compliance with all conditions of the approval. If not, the approval could be made void for the outdoor storage, showers and changing buses.

Kaczynski advised that while the applicant can agree to any condition voluntarily that the Board imposes, the Board can impose whatever conditions it sees fit in order to enable the Board to grant the variances. This is irrespective of whether the applicant agrees with the condition. The applicant can apply to the Board for the amendment of a particular condition if there are reasons why they are not able to comply with the condition.

Fritsche advised fire access is important. He felt the screening suggested by the applicant does not improve the front of the building and feels that the outdoor storage should be permitted due to the nature of the business. He feels it complies with the zone and is a service to the community. **Giannone** agrees that the tubes and life jackets should not be covered up. The Board decided to focus on the outdoor storage variance first. **Freedman** advised she has no issue with the outside storage; however, she disagrees and feels it is an eyesore. She feels it looks worse than the neighboring sites with outdoor storage. Having the storage between the building and the street brings the aesthetics down. **Deputy Mayor Pfefferle** advised that to him it is an eyesore. He doesn't agree with the need for temporary solutions to permanent issues. **Papazian** advised he concurs with Pfefferle. **Canavan** advised he believes the 6' height recommendation regardless of netting makes sense. **Banisch** advised netting could be less desirably aesthetic. **Papazian** felt the netting could be ripped by wind and would look worse over time.

Canavan made a motion to approve the outside storage in the front yard with the condition that it is only 6' high. **Giannone** seconded the motion. In connection with that motion would be limiting the height of the flotation devices to the stacking of 6'. **Ayes: Chair Rochelle, Fritsche, Canavan, Giannone, and Kimsey. Nays: Papazian, Freedman, and Committeeman Kiernan. Motion Carried.**

Chair Rochelle advised the next discussion was for the changing buses, showers and canopies for seasonal operation. **Banisch** advised the condition on this variance is that every vehicle installed onsite needs to be registered and operational. Discussion ensued regarding the time frames for the seasonal facilities to be installed. **Committeeman Kiernan** felt that having these facilities would be beneficial for the patrons on site and should be provided. The Board asked Mr. Crance if seasonal installation from May 15th – September 15th would be sufficient. He advised the season is from May 15th to September 30th. Crance advised the shower facilities would be rented and moved off-site to the company that owns them. The changing buses will be parked with the regular buses that the applicant uses to operate. Crance advised the changing buses are buses that used to be road worthy for the transportation of patrons. They removed the seats and put five changing rooms inside. They were once registered but do not go on the road and are currently not registered. Crance advised they could be registered, but not ideal. He continued that if the Board requires it, he will comply. Crance advised sheds would be ideal but due to the impervious coverage, he did not believe they could install the sheds. Attorney De Sapio advised it would be best to get through this year and come back to this in the future. **Decker** advised it would address ADA accessibility for the changing rooms. Attorney De Sapio advised with regard to the changing buses, he doesn't see a reason for them to be registered. **Kaczynski** advised the Board could make a condition that all buses be registered except the two changing buses, and the one bus used for scrap has to be removed within 30 days.

Committeeman Kiernan made a motion to approve the changing buses, port-o-johns, and portable showers with the condition that any and all vehicles be registered and be placed no earlier than May 15th and removed no later than October 1st. The port-o-johns and portable showers will be moved off-site and the buses be moved according to the site plan. **Papazian** seconded the motion. **Ayes: Chair Rochelle, Papazian, Fritsche, Freedman, Canavan, Committeeman Kiernan, Giannone, and Kimsey. No Nays. Motion Carried.**

Banisch advised the next variance is for design exceptions, for the parking areas, display areas, where 30 feet is required and 4 feet is proposed. Parking lot surface improvements and requirements which have to be graded surface with asphalt and drained versus gravel that is being proposed. Attorney De Sapio advised that no additional parking is proposed, and the parking area has already been approved in the previous site plan approval as gravel. He asked why that would be changed when there is no additional parking proposed. **Decker** advised these design exceptions were previously granted. He continued that is why the parking areas need to be restriped each year, due to the stripping fading each year. **Decker** did say that there are parking areas that have standing water and are not usable spots. These would need to be graded to provide positive drainage in that area. **Decker** advised that when the entrance was realigned on the northernly side for the buses to come in, the base course pavement was put down but the top course pavement was never installed and there is some site plan issues from 2016 that still are outstanding and need to be addressed. **Kaczynski** advised this is one of the conditions that was required by the court and would carry over. **Papazian** made a motion to rely on the 2016 site plan approval in addition with the condition of regrading as necessary as per the engineer's recommendation and the necessary design exceptions other than what was previously granted is to be included as well. **Canavan** seconded the motion. **Ayes: Chair Rochelle, Papazian, Fritsche, Freedman, Canavan, Committeeman Kiernan, Giannone, and Kimsey. No Nays. Motion Carried.**

The next variance to be considered are the jersey barriers in the front to remain all year round. The original approval indicated that the barriers need to be removed at the end of the season. **Kaczynski** advised this needs to be addressed as part of the amended site plan approval. **Papazian** asked the applicant the issue with removing the barriers. Antonio De Sapio advised the issue is with the tenants and parking, once the barriers are removed and then reinstalled each season. There was a brief discussion with regards to the barriers being removed in the past. **Decker** asked if there is striping in

the area where the barriers are now. Antonio De Sapio advised there is. **Fritsche** made a motion that the applicant not be required to remove the jersey barriers at the end of the season. There was no second. **Papazian** made a motion to deny the request to keep the jersey barriers in the front all year round. **Committeeman Kiernan** seconded the motion. **Ayes: Chair Rochelle, Papazian, Freedman, Canavan, Committeeman Kiernan, Giannone, and Kimsey. Nays: Fritsche. Motion Carried.**

The street trees for the design exceptions were brought back for a vote. This was from the 2016 site plan approval that trees be planted between the street and the curb along the front of the building. There was testimony that there were delays due to JCP&L not moving the poles. There are also site issues regarding the trees by the road and the county not allowing the trees to be placed here. The Board needs documentation from the County stating that the trees are not permitted in this area. If the trees cannot be placed there, then shrubs would be required, so long as the shrubs do not grow to a height as to obscure the sight distance. There was some discussion by the board regarding the height of shrubs. **Papazian** made a motion that the trees from the 2016 Bohsenburg site plan will be planted unless documentation from the HCPB is provided by the applicant that trees are prohibited. If documentation is provided, then slow growing shrubs will be planted so as not to obscure the sight distance unless also prohibited by the County. **Canavan** seconded the motion. **Ayes: Chair Rochelle, Papazian, Fritsche, Freedman, Canavan, Committeeman Kiernan, Giannone, and Kimsey. No Nays. Motion Carried.**

Kaczynski advised the next step is a motion on the amended site plan. These are site plan related conditions which have not already been incorporated into other forms of relief. Attorney De Sapio advised that the work within the landfill area can not be restored until the state gives their approval. **Banisch** advised the Board could impose the condition to require revegetation and restoration to the south side of the site, unless the applicant is prevented from doing so by documentation from the NJDEP. Attorney De Sapio advised that it would be acceptable to come back to the Board once the landfill has been delineated. The applicant also feels this will be part of Georgia Pacific's responsibility. **Decker** asked the applicant when the gravel in the landfill area was put in. Antonio De Sapio advised the gravel put in that area was probably done 15 years ago. **Banisch** asked if the applicant had provided documentation from the NJDEP of what can and cannot be done in this area. Antonio De Sapio advised that they thought that area was not part of the landfill but found out later that the area is in question. **Decker** asked Attorney De Sapio for clarification regarding what entity is responsible for the actual delineation. Antonio De Sapio advised that Georgia Pacific submitted a plan but the project was not complete. More than likely Georgia Pacific would be the ones to hire a professional to make the delineation and submit this to the state. **Decker** advised the process is similar to a wetland delineation. A consultant would make the delineation and submit it to the state. The state then approves that delineation. This discussion was sidelined for the next meeting.

Kaczynski advised next are the 5 spaces. **Giannone** clarified that his suggestion to the engineer was that the 5 spaces eliminated, could be accommodated at the extreme southerly end of the parking lot. **Kaczynski** summarized it is essentially relocating the 5 spaces. The condition is that in consultation with the fire official and in satisfaction of the planner and engineer, the net of 120 would be the same with the relocation of those 5 spaces.

Lot closed signs shall be posted until such time as more spaces are available. Attorney De Sapio agreed with this condition. Next was the relocation of the jersey barrier at the easterly side near the gym for better turning access for emergency vehicles to enter the main lot. The one parking space would be eliminated at the gym which is not needed. The applicant agreed.

Kaczynski advised next is the signage at the southerly access to the site indicating "Emergency^[11] Fire Access." **Giannone** advised this is not necessary. Next is the post and rail fence on the site measuring 4'

in height on the southerly limit of the parking lot adjacent to the southerly access drive aisle vs. the proposed barrels with chains. Antonio De Sapio advised it doesn't matter where you put the barrels because it doesn't penetrate the ground, but it does matter where the post and rail fence is placed. The Board discussed different options. Attorney De Sapio advised due to the multiple agencies watching the site, parking will be adhered to in this area.

The Board decided to stop at this condition regarding the barrels and return to the condition at the next Board meeting of August 19th. The list of conditions will be provided to the applicant prior to next month's meeting. **Decker** asked for an email or letter to confirm the DEP's position on the area in question. Attorney De Sapio consented to an extension of August 19th.

- K Street & Peacefield Management Group – Site Plan – Use Variance – Public Hearing
Block 15 Lot 10
681 Cty Road 513

Kaczynski stated for the record that Class I and Class III members are recused since this is a Use Variance. **Papazian** recused himself as well at 9:12pm.

Attorney Lawrence Cohen was present on behalf of the applicant seeking a D1 variance two principle uses on one lot. One is a bed and breakfast, which is a conditional use, the second is which is a conditional use pursuant to the ordinance. He continued there was an existing kennel for many years. The original 300 acre lot was subdivided. The property for the variance is in excess of 80 acres and has two exception areas which has been restricted to agricultural uses except what is called the exception area. The applicant submitted a letter from the state department of agricultural indicating that this does not interfere with the proposed uses.

The conditional use limits the kennel to 30 dogs. These dogs will be trained for public use such as police departments, first responders, and security. There will also be a section for lay people to use the kennel for their dogs. In addition, there will be some obedience classes for these dogs as well.

Kaczynski marked the application and supporting documents submitted as exhibit A-1, and the notice for public hearing as exhibit A-2. **Kaczynski** swore in Robert Aromando-applicant, Aram Papazian-applicant, and Peter Fleming-Engineer, along with the Board professionals, David Banisch and Tom Decker. The professional present on behalf of the applicant were deemed to be qualified professionals.

The first witness Robert Aromando, partner in K Street Group, offers security protective services, and has been in business for 15 years. He advised his clients include ShopRite, Healthquest, and individual clients who travel outside the United States and require additional security. He advised members of K Street are either retired or active law enforcement. The applicant also has a K-9 division started about 3 years ago. He advised there is a need in the state not only for bomb detection dogs, but also for search and rescue dogs as well. He advised they have a total of 9 dogs. One is a bomb detection dog, and one dog is in training for cadaver. He continued they to assist police departments. He advised they work with the Clinton police department. They also work outside of NJ and have offices in Boston and Chicago. They also operate outside of the United States.

Attorney Cohen asked what type of services will the applicant provide at this property. Aromando advised it will have two sections one for law enforcement and first responders, the second section will be for pet owners for the purpose of boarding, doggie day care and obedience training. He advised they

will offer to the Township a K-9 an emergency medicine kit. Their vet, Dr. Marty Siegel in Flemington, will be putting a course together and will be teaching it. This course will be open to any pet owners in the township.

Attorney Cohen displayed the tactical training floor plan sheet C-5 - 100 dated July 14th to the Board. This was marked as exhibit A-3. Referring to the site plan, Aromondo confirmed the building being used is existing which was previously used as a kennel for about 140 dogs. His plan will be limited to 30 dogs. He described for the Board where the different activities will take place on the site plan. He advised the law enforcement and first responders section will be completely separate from the pet owner section. The applicant is also working with NJ German Shephard Rescue and Sedona German Shephard Rescue, where they will be holding the dogs until a suitable home is found. There will be 15 kennels in each section. He advised there is also an interior training area. These will be one-on-one sessions.

He continued to describe the activities that will take place utilizing the floor plan sheet. **Banisch** asked for clarification where the activities will take place. The applicant advised what each section of the facility is to be used for. He advised there is a fenced in courtyard between the two wings. This will be utilized for training dogs outside when the weather is appropriate. They will not permit dogs to be outside alone. The dogs will be leashed, walked and tracked with GPS. Aromondo described the types of courses that will be offered. There will never be any firearms at this facility and they do not train bite dogs.

Attorney Cohen asked the applicant where the other facilities are located. Aromondo advised, there are facilities in Yardley, PA, Vineland, NJ and Coldwell, NJ. Those facilities will remain open so they can be geographically convenient to clients. Aromondo showed the Board an exhibit with pictures and a summary of the individuals responsible for the facility, this was marked as A-4. He named and described each individual's qualifications on the exhibit. There was a total of 5 individuals including Aromondo.

Attorney Cohen asked the applicant how the private portion of the kennel will be utilized. Aromondo advised the applicant will have an app that clients will be able to use. The facility is by appointment only; no walk-ins will be accepted. Drop-offs and pick-ups will all be scheduled. The hours of operation for the private kennel will be Monday through Friday from 8:00am-6:00pm.

Aromondo stated the formal training will be Monday through Saturday, he believes from 10:00am to 3:00pm. He advised that dogs can only be trained for short periods of time. Attorney Cohen asked how long a dog is in training before it is fully trained and released to a police department. Aromondo advised about a two month period, depending on the type of training.

Attorney Cohen asked how the waste from the dogs will be handled. Aromondo advised that they developed an 11 page protocol for the handling of waste and described the process. Solid waste is put into a bio-degradable bag and thrown in the trash. The trash hauler confirmed this is acceptable. He provided a copy of the protocol to the County Board of Health. He advised there is no formal approval process with the County but the protocol needs to be on file.

Attorney Cohen asked if there is a vet on call all the time. Aromondo stated that Marty Siegel is the veterinarian on call 24 hours a day. Attorney Cohen asked how the facility is to be cleaned. Aromondo advised the kennels will be sanitized 2x per week.

Attorney Cohen asked approximately how far the bed and breakfast will be from the kennel facility. Aromondo replied about 800'. Attorney Cohen then asked how far away is the nearest residence. Aromondo replied about 1800 ft. Attorney Cohen asked approximately how long the previous kennel was in use for. Papazian replied the first wing was built in the 1970's and the second wing shortly thereafter. The kennel was in use until 1991 or 1992.

Attorney Cohen asked Aromondo how the building fits his needs. He explained that it is ideally suited due to the facility being isolated, barely seen from route 513, and the existing kennel. Attorney Cohen had no further questions for Aromondo.

Giannone asked regarding exhibit A-3 if these classrooms will have emergency type training classes that may or may not have anything to do with the kennel. Aromondo advised that is the case and there are courses that will be for civilians as well. Aromondo advised the primary purpose of the facility is K-9 and would have training incidental to the K-9 use. Attorney Cohen asked what type of training would happen at the facility that is not related to K-9. Aromondo advised possibly CPR and AED training. Attorney Cohen asked if there will be any tactical training. Aromondo replied no. Tactical training occurs at one of the annex facilities or down at the firing range in Flemington. There will not be any firearm training.

Attorney Cohen asked regarding training for the pet owner, how many participants would be in attendance. Aromondo advised these classes would be limited to no more than 4 due to working with individuals and that this class size is manageable. Aromondo added if there was a large response for a class, they would have it in a facility that is capable of handling a larger group. **Giannone** asked about the size of the classrooms for determining an occupancy limit. Attorney Cohen asked if Aromondo was willing to accept a restriction with a class size of no more than 4. Aromondo advised yes, he would restrict the class size to 4.

Fritsche asked if there would be any farm related dog training. Aromondo replied no. **Canavan** asked if there were any restrictions to the breed of dog being trained. Aromondo described the most likely breeds on the law enforcement side like labs, beagles and malamars, and any dog on the civilian side.

Attorney Cohen asked where the storage of food would be for the dogs. Aromondo advised in the kennel area. Aromondo advised the facilities will be air conditioned and heated. In addition, there will be a backup generator. Attorney Cohen asked if there would be any outdoor kennels. Aromondo replied no. Previously there were outdoor kennels, however these will be removed.

Banisch asked for confirmation that the maximum will be 30 dogs. He advised this is a requirement by ordinance. **Kaczynski** advised there can be no more than 30 dogs at one time. She continued if there were 15 personal dogs and 15 dogs on the law enforcement side, if 4 dogs came in for training, it would cause 34 dogs to be onsite. Papazian said a max of 30 dogs will be boarded, however 4 more dogs may come in for training. Attorney Cohen asked if Aromondo would keep it limited to a total of 30 dogs. Aromondo advised no, that it may be a max of 34 dogs during the training sessions. They would not be able to house additional dogs though because there is a limit of 30 kennels. **Banisch** asked for clarification that there would be a maximum of 30 dogs being boarded, and up to a maximum 35 dogs on site when the other 5 dogs are there for training sessions. Aromondo said yes.

Banisch asked if the county issues approvals for the waste management plan that was filed. Aromondo said no. He advised all they did was stamp it. **Banisch** asked Aromondo if he can get a copy of the regulations and a form showing their plan conforms to those regulations. Aromondo advised he can. **Banisch** asked if there was anything that would generate noise at the property lines from the kennel. Aromondo said no.

Banisch asked about the types of trainings that do not involve K-9's. Aromondo advised this is more of a public service for first responders or community members that need their certification. Aromondo advised the classes would be published on social media separately from the K-9 business. **Banisch** asked if the programs could happen at another facility. Aromondo stated it could happen at a facility in Annandale if there were more participants than 4. **Banisch** asked how many hours are these courses and how many days would they occur. Aromondo stated it depends on how many people are interested. He advised they offer a tazer course in their Annandale facility and this is about 3 people at a time, every other week. Those classes would be held during the regular business hours mentioned. Aromondo clarified these types of classes may occur 4 days a month for 4 or 5 hours in a day. **Banisch** advised that it sounds like this is in accessory to the K-9 business. Aromondo agreed.

Giannone asked how many classrooms are at the facility. Aromondo replied 4. Attorney Cohen asked how many employees will be at the facility. Aromondo replied 3 or 4, which includes a kennel master, 2 for animal care and a receptionist. The kennel master is responsible for compliance. The trainers would come in when needed. Aromondo advised one person will stay overnight to watch the dogs. He continued there will be 24 hour monitoring, plus the cameras. **Fritsche** advised previously when he had been in the building when it was a kennel, the sound of the dogs was deafening. Aromondo said the previous kennel owners had 140 dogs and some were outside. **Fritsche** said he had been in the building when there were only 30 and there was a lot of noise. **Fritsche** asked how the applicant will control the noise inside the building. Aromondo advised the dogs will be kept in separate areas so that they do not mix and the building is made out of block and is fairly soundproof. The dogs will not be outside. Papazian advised at one time the dogs when owned by J&J, were allowed to be outside on dog runs, however the FDA advised they can not be allowed outside while on drug trials. The building was then sealed, and there was not any noise.

Kaczynski asked for clarification that all dogs will be on leashes except when in the fenced in area. Aromondo confirmed that is correct. **Fritsche** advised there are three uses on the property, one of which is a farm, and asked how this contributes to the farm use on the property. Papazian advised this property has been farmed and will continue to be farmed to the same extent that it has been for 50 years. **Chair Rochelle** advised we are in the phase of asking questions of the witness and asked if anyone else has any questions of the witness.

Chair Rochelle asked for any questions from the public.

Edna Bercaw, 6 Bonnell Road, advised her property backs up to the proposed kennel. She asked the maximum amount of dogs and dimensions of the courtyard and how it will be used. Aromondo advised 30 dogs, there will be agility courses out there and there will be one trainer and one dog outside. The dimensions are 30'x40'. The area will be astro turf.

Michelle Alberdi, 8 Bonnell Road, asked where the waste will be stored. Attorney Cohen advised the engineer will testify to that. Aromondo advised the trash is picked up 3x per week. She advised she has questions regarding the noise since trees have been cut down to what she believes is her property line.

Charlie Chiswick, 7 Bonnell Road, asked about the trees being cut down as well and asked if this would be addressed at the next meeting.

Attorney Cohen advised the next witness is Papazian, and the engineer will be at the meeting next month on August 19th.

Kaczynski adjourned this matter. It will carry over without further notice to August 19th.

10:16pm – Papazian rejoined the Board.

Correspondence

None

Comments from the Board/Public

No further comments.

Approval of Bills

A motion was made to approve the bills for the professionals of the Land Use Board by **Pauch** and seconded by **Fritsche**. **Vote: Ayes: Chair Rochelle, Fritsche, Freedman, Canavan, Giannone, Pauch and Kimsey. Abstain: Papazian. No Nays. Motion Carried.**

Motion to Adjourn

A motion to adjourn was made by **Papazian** and seconded by **Pauch** at 10:17pm. **Vote: All Ayes. No Nays. Motion Carried.**

Leigh Gronau, Board Secretary